



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,718	01/20/2004	Noam Eshkoli	199-0227US	3719

29855 7590 08/10/2005

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,
P.C.
20333 SH 249
SUITE 600
HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER

RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/761,718	Applicant(s) ESHKOLI ET AL.	
	Examiner Melur Ramakrishnaiah	Art Unit 2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1-20-2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 8, 12, 16-17, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Lai et al. (US PAT: 6,288,740, hereinafter Lai).

Regarding claim 1, Lai discloses a method for user in composing one or more compressed video input streams into at least one compressed output stream of a composed layout, the method comprising: converting each one of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded stream, wherein each of the sub-encoded stream is associated with a segment in at least one compressed output stream of the composed layout, manipulating the one or more sub-encoded streams according to the location of the associated segment in the composed layout of the compressed output stream, and transferring the manipulated one or more sub-encoded streams as the compressed output stream (figs. 1-2, col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 61, col. 6 lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 12, Lai discloses a method for use in composing sub-encoded video input streams from two or more endpoint into to one compressed output stream of a compressed layout, the method comprising: receiving the sub-encoded video input streams from two more end points (38, fig. 3), associating each one of the two or more sub-encoded video input streams to a segment in the composed layout, manipulating

Art Unit: 2643

the received sub-encoded video input streams from two or more endpoints according to the location of its associated segment in the composed layout of the compressed output stream, and transferring the manipulated two or more sub-encoded streams as the compressed output stream (figs. 1-2, col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 61, col. 6 lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 17, Lai discloses a system comprising: at least two input modules (for example 102-i, fig. 2) being operative to receive a compressed input stream, and deliver one or more sub-encoded streams, at least one output module in (VCP 26) being operative to receive two or more sub-encoded streams, and deliver a compressed output stream of a composed layout, wherein the output module manipulates location dependent information in the sub-encoded stream according to its location in the composed layout (figs. 1-2, col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 61, col. 6 lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 2-5 and 22, Lai further teaches the following: transferring one or more sub-encoded streams of each one of the two or more compressed video input streams to a sub-encoded common interface (reads on 82, fig. 2), getting from the sub-encoded common interface the one or more sub-encoded streams that are associated with the output stream, converting each one of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded stream further comprises changing the resolution of sub-encoded stream (col. 5 lines 11-14), converting each one of the two or more compressed video input streams into one or more sub-encoded stream is independent of the location of the associated segment of the sub-encoded stream in the compressed output stream, a compressed common interface (reads on 36, figs.1-2), a

Art Unit: 2643

sub-encoded common interface, wherein the compressed video common interface is operative to carry the compressed input streams and compressed output stream and wherein the sub-encoded common interface is operative to carry the sub-encoded streams between the input modules and output module (figs. 1-2, col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 61, col. 6 lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 8, 16, 21, Lai teaches the following: one or more sub-encoded streams are not QCIF compliant (this is implied in as much as the reference discloses codec without any reference to QCIF, col. 4 lines 61-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-7, 9-10, 11 13-15, 18-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0099294, filed 11-20-2002, hereinafter Wang).

Regarding claims 6-7, 11, 13-15, 18-20, Lai does not teach the following:
compressed output stream conforms to: the H.264 standard, MPEG-4 part 10 standard, H.263, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, and MPEG-4 standards.

However, Wang discloses picture level adaptive frame/field coding for digital video content which teaches the following: numerous video coding methods such as

Art Unit: 2643

the H.264 standard, MPEG-4 part 10 standard, H.263, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, and MPEG-4 standards (Paragraphs: 0001, 0007, 0039).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Lai's system to provide for the following: compressed output stream conforms to: the H.264 standard, MPEG-4 part 10 standard, H.263, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, and MPEG-4 standards as this arrangement would provide for coding and decoding standards which would be useful for coding and decoding under variety of circumstances, thus enhancing the application capability of the video system.


Regarding claims 9-10, Lai teaches the following: combining two or more segments into one slice group, two or more segments are combined into one slice group do not share a raster scan line (col. 5 lines 56-61).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643